

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**NVTC RFP 24-05 Pre-Proposal Conference**  
**Via Electronic Participation**  
**January 6, 2025**

**List of Attendees**

<b>NVTC Staff</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Vikram Sinha	Senior Program Manager Envision Route 7 BRT
Scott Kalkwarf	Director of Finance and Administration
Tenley O'Hara	Legislative and Administrative Assistant

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Firm</b>
Vishal Kothalkar	LanceSoft, Inc.
Aditya Inamdar	Kittelsohn & Associates
Marlene Wong	RK&K
Roshan Kone	LanceSoft, Inc
Cody Christensen	TYLin City Solutions
Chris McCarty	Quality Counts
Felicia Woodruff	Woodruff Company Engineered Solutions
Jennifer DeBruhl	RK&K
Jon Crisafi	Kittelsohn & Associates
Adrita Islam	Fehr & Peers
Jennifer Koch	Rhodeside Harwell
Joel Kirzner	Volkert, Inc.
Jiaxin Tong	RK&K
Robert B. Schiesel	Gorove Slade Associates
John Bavoso	Kimly-Horn
Paul Silberman	Mead & Hunt
Christian Arkell	TYLin City Solutions
Shravya Markandeya	Colliers Engineering & Design
Haley Curtin	TYLin City Solutions
Jody Fisher	NeoNiche Strategies
Grace Timbario	NeoNiche Strategies
Dalia Leven	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Scott Dunn	Timmons Group
Lucas Muller	Kimly-Horn
Nate Conable	Fehr & Peers
Sravya Sarvani	LanceSoft, Inc

## Overview

The NVTC RFP Pre-Proposal Conference focused on the Envision Route 7 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, a key transit initiative connecting Tysons to the Mark Center in Alexandria. This project spans four jurisdictions: Fairfax County, Falls Church, Arlington, and Alexandria. The current phase (Phase 4-2) aims to analyze mobility benefits, traffic impacts, and operational issues, building on previous phases of the project. The meeting provided an opportunity for potential offerors to ask questions, clarify RFP requirements, and understand the expectations for the upcoming tasks, deliverables, and deadlines.

RFP available at [www.novatransit.org/procurement](http://www.novatransit.org/procurement)

## Key Tasks Discussed

The meeting outlined nine core tasks included in the RFP. Key highlights include project management, which emphasizes collaboration, progress reporting and technical advisory briefings. Data collection efforts will focus on gathering traffic and travel time data for critical intersections to support detailed Vissim modeling. Tasks 4 and 5 involve developing existing traffic simulations and projecting future scenarios to evaluate the BRT's benefits, including reduced greenhouse gas emissions and improved safety. Public outreach will play a significant role, given the project's diverse community context, requiring multi-language translation and innovative engagement strategies. The final report will compile findings into an accessible and visually compelling document. Specific jurisdiction analyses for Falls Church and Alexandria will address HOV vs. bus lane comparisons, queue jump feasibility, and terminus location evaluation.

## Key Deadlines

The timeline for the RFP is as follows: Written questions are due by January 13, 2025, with responses expected by January 17. Proposals must be submitted by January 31, 2025. Interviews, if needed, will follow, and the award notification is scheduled for April 2025. The project's completion is targeted for September 2026.

RFP available at [www.novatransit.org/procurement](http://www.novatransit.org/procurement)

## Notable Questions and Clarifications (Edited for brevity. Full video of presentation available separately)

### 1. Dalia Leven, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

- **Question:** Do you need new corridor level ridership forecasts or just stop level forecasts as part of this effort?
- **Response:** We're looking at corridor-level forecasts, but stop-level data may be considered in the future if deemed useful for stakeholders. [NVTC] wants the report to allow decision makers and policy makers to better make choices and to create actionable items.

### 2. Aditya Inamdar, Kittelson & Associates

- **Question:** Are BRT alternatives tested with existing traffic in Task 4 integral to modeling future traffic in Task 5?
- **Response:** Yes, Task 4 focuses on existing traffic, while Task 5 models future years based on Task 4's outputs. Our intention here was to have the model as a specific task ... develop the existing traffic simulation, verify [the model], it's calibrated, and it's good. And then task five was to model out the future years, once the current ridership, the current model is created.
- **Question:** Are we keeping Phase III in mind for Task 5?
- **Response:** For background, Phase III occurred in 2019 and dealt with estimates for construction, it can be taken into account but is by no means set in stone.
- **Question:** Is there additional funding for data collection beyond the hour estimates quoted in the RFP?
- **Response:** The hours are just the estimated consultant effort. We view the data collection as a fixed cost that is supplemental and is not included in our estimates.

### 3. Vishal Kothalkar, LanceSoft, Inc.

- **Question:** Is this RFP representing a brand-new initiative?
- **Response:** No, this RFP is part of an ongoing project.
- **Question:** Where does the budget come from for this project?
- **Response:** The project is funded by a federal grant, secured by Congressmembers Beyer and Connolly.
- **Question:** Is there a preference for local vendors?
- **Response:** No preference is given for local vendors.

### 4. John Bovoso, Kimly-Horn:

- **Question:** Page 2 lists an 8.42% DBE goal, while Attachment D specifies 14.7%. Which is correct?
- **Response:** The DBE goal is 8.42%; the discrepancy will be addressed in writing. (This has been completed as Addendum No. 1 on January 7, 2025)

### 5. Jennifer Koch, RHI

- **Question:** Does NVTC prefer specific tools for public feedback portals?
- **Response:** NVTC is open to any tools the consultant is comfortable with, emphasizing flexibility.

### 6. Joel Kirzner, Volkert, Inc.

- **Question:** Are the previous phase reports available in full on any websites for reference?

- **Response:** Yes, the NVTC website has previous Phase 1 through 3 as well as phase 4-1. Phase 4-0 is also hosted on Fairfax County's website.

#### 7. Adrita Islam, Fehr & Peers

- **Question:** Is there a task for conceptual design for the new alternatives? Is it going to be the same level of detail as the previous studies?
- **Response:** We believe you are referring to the Fall Church task, specifically. We are looking for a more refined conceptual design than previous studies. The previous phase provided a high-level conceptual design, and we are looking for a more refined product for that que jump analysis.
- **Question:** Will the HOV lane in Falls Church be curbside?
- **Response:** Yes, the HOV or BAT lane is assumed to be curbside.
- **Question:** Is the Metrobus 28A route still needed as part of the scope?
- **Response:** The current existing Metrobus 28A route is to be renamed the F20 as part of the Better Bus Network redesign by WMATA. There are some differences between the 28A route versus Envision Rt 7. We are going to have conversations with WMATA about aligning their bus route with Envision Rt 7 or doing supplemental service. We're still interested in the actual study corridor as proposed by Envision Rt 7, rather than the existing bus service for the 28A, soon to be F20.

#### 8. Jon Crisafi, Kittelson & Associates

- **Question:** You mentioned that previous Vissim models would be provided, is the intention that this next effort would expand upon that?
- **Response:** Our intention with providing those models was to further expand the model and understand the corridor to get a better understanding of how the project can move forward.
- **Question:** Are you looking for performance metrics from older parts of the network in addition to the new? Or are you trying to just kind of keep it as a legacy model to maybe run your own thing down the line? For you guys to have to maybe run your own stuff later.
- **Response:** No, we're not looking to run our own stuff later. We are aiming to find out what benefits Envision Rt 7 would bring to the community and what projects could bring about tangible benefits to the community in the next few years, and, if we were to build out the entire corridor treatments the eventual pursuit of a capital project, that is the end goal here. (NVTC plans to utilize the model to advance implementation of BRT).

#### 9. Aditya Inamdar, Kittelson & Associates

- **Question:** Does Task 8 require revisiting the Vissim model?
- **Response:** Yes, revisiting and refining the model will be necessary for comparative analysis.
- **Question:** Would Seven Corners be included in the analysis?
- **Response:** There is one stop prior to Seven Corners that serves as an anchor, but the majority are afterward. We anticipate the Seven Corners capital project will change the dynamic substantially, therefore we did not see a need to collect data in the Seven Corners area. Rather, we're focusing after Seven Corners on down (south).

#### **10. Lucas Miller, Kimly-Horn**

- **Question:** Are station locations or alignments subject to change?
- **Response:** Station locations are mostly set, but NVTC is open to adjustments if the case can be made that they improve service or provide community benefits. [NVTC] alignment for the bus looks to utilize West End transit way in Alexandria, so there is definitely an appetite for some alignment changes, if that helps improve bus service.